
From: Eric Wedemeyer <ewedemeyer@co.shasta.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Wallace, Keith@DWR
Subject: Comments on Draft 2014 PSPs and GLs

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr. Wallace-

Have read the 2014 documents and have the following comments:

- GL's, page 14 (CWC 10920 Compliance): As SBx7-6 promised, if a basin isn't monitored in CASGEM, non-DAC project proponents are grant ineligible. That doesn't make sense for projects that don't change groundwater levels and it may not make sense for low-priority basins.
- PSP, page 12 (Geographic Information). Latitude and longitude for regions is too precise. DWR should provide a table of lats and longs for each IRWM, or simply allow names.
- PSP, page 20, Table 4. This table reiterates the goals of the legislation, but it's not referenced elsewhere in the document. What is this table doing in here at all?
- PSP, page 33. Are Labor Compliance Programs (LCP) required by SB 104? DIR is in the process of modifying the LCP procedures in general. Currently, they charge based on the value of the work. Will Proposition 84 pay? Is there a DIR liaison to DWR? What are we to do about the uncertainty due to this rapidly changing program?

Thanks,

/Eric

Eric Wedemeyer, PE
Supervising Engineer
Shasta County Department of Public Works
Shasta County Water Agency
(530) 225-5181